

17275

# SPEECH OF MR. J. J. HARDIN, OF ILLINOIS, ON THE TARIFF BILL,

SHOWING

## THE ADVANTAGES OF A PROTECTIVE TARIFF TO FARMERS.

---

Delivered in the House of Representatives of the United States, May 7th, 1844.

---

MR. SPEAKER: That class of our population which is the most numerous; which best retains their republican simplicity of character, and purity of heart; which is least corrupted by the vices of foreign nations, and is the most honest and virtuous portion of our community, is composed of the farmers of the United States.

The district I have the honor to represent, is one of the most lovely portions of this Union; it is as fertile as the valley of the Nile, and yields in the richest profusion all the necessities of life in reward for the toil of the husbandman; and it already teems with inhabitants, either engaged in farming pursuits or wholly dependant upon those who are. It is to be expected, therefore, that I should feel, in common with them, an interest in all legislation calculated to affect their prosperity. In my judgment there is no subject of more vital importance to them, or which more immediately affects the products of their labor, than the tariff. I shall, therefore, in the brief space which is allotted to me, confine my remarks exclusively to the effects of a protective tariff upon the farming portion of our community, and I will present facts taken from undoubted sources of information, connected with inferences necessarily growing out of those facts, which must commend this subject to the favorable consideration of every American farmer.

The agricultural community in the United States is divided into two classes—the *planters* who produce cotton, rice, sugar, and tobacco, and the *farmers* who produce beef, pork, horses, corn, wheat, hemp, potatoes, and other similar products. It can easily be shown that the tariff is no injury but an advantage to the planter, but it is as it affects the farmer that I will examine it.

*Farmers are directly interested in the protection which is afforded to the production of wool, hemp, wheat, and potatoes, and of other similar productions, which, however, with these exceptions, are rarely imported into the United States.*

We learned from the able and interesting speech of the gentleman from Vermont, (Judge COLLAMER,) that the first sheep, from which wool could be raised to make broadcloth, were imported into the United States in 1809 from Spain. Our markets being supplied with cloths from other countries, this description of sheep improved but slowly until after the passage of the tariff of 1824. Since that time they have rapidly increased, and have been greatly improved by importations from Saxony. In 1840 there were 19,311,374 sheep in the United States, and the annual product of wool returned in the census is 35,802,114 pounds. Sheep are raised in the United States almost exclusively for their wool, as they are less profitable for meat than either cattle or hogs. *To protect the raising of sheep and the growth of wool, you must protect also the manufactures of wool;* for if the goods which are made of wool come into this country free of duty, and destroy our woollen manufactories, there is no one left to buy the wool from the farmer, and his sheep are an expense upon his hands.

The tariff upon wool costing above 7 cents a pound, was fixed in 1842 at 3 cents a pound and 30 per cent. ad valorem. This is considered sufficient protection by our wool-growers. There is a description of coarse wool which is admitted at a duty of 5 per cent. This kind of wool is not raised in the United States, and not coming into competition with our wool, which is of a finer and more costly description, is admitted at a small duty, for the purpose of encouraging its manufacture in the United States. It is produced in England, where sheep are raised for their

mutton, and in Smyrna and South America, where the sheep require no attention except that of herding and shearing. They are of a much larger breed than ours, yielding from six to ten pounds to the fleece. It is an invariable law of nature, that you cannot have large sheep and fine wool. The wool of these sheep is so coarse that it is only used for carpets, baize, blankets, &c.; and although the duty is but nominal, it will be seen by the tables of imports that the imports of coarse wool have fallen off since the passage of the tariff of 1842. It is apparent, therefore, that this coarse wool does not compete with the wool grown in the United States. The tariff bill now under discussion proposes to raise the duty on this coarse wool, which costs less than 7 cents a pound, to 15 per cent. This will make a duty of one cent a pound on this description of wool; at the same time this bill proposes to take off the duty of *three cents a pound*, which is now imposed by law, on such wool as we do raise in the United States. This is a singular free trade way of protecting the American wool-grower, from which I hope we will be spared.

*HEMP is another article which needs protection.* The largest portion of the hemp used in the United States is grown in Russia, where it is raised by the labor of serfs who belong to, and are sold with the estates on which they reside, and who are compelled to raise it for their owners. Of course such labor as this can undersell our American hemp, at least until its culture is permanently and extensively established. When we reflect what vast quantities of hemp are annually required for the rigging of the navy and shipping of the United States, and for bagging and bale rope for baling cotton, some idea may be formed of the large number of laborers which would be employed, and the vast amount of money which would be distributed amongst the farmers of the United States, if all the hemp used in the United States was produced here. Kentucky has long been engaged in its culture, and since the passage of the tariff of 1842, which has afforded protection to this branch of industry, large quantities of hemp have been produced in Illinois, Missouri, and Indiana. It is now admitted that as good an article is produced in the United States as is imported, and with the improvements which have recently been made in cutting, breaking, and handling hemp, it is certain that, if Congress will but let the existing laws remain, there will soon be produced an abundance of hemp for the consumption of the whole Union.

*WHEAT and POTATOES*, though raised in great abundance, are more largely imported than is generally supposed. This appears from a statement of "imported Wheat and Potatoes," submitted to this House at the present session by the Secretary of the Treasury, from which I will read the imports of five years.

	Bushels of wheat.	Value.	Bushels of potatoes.	Value.
1835	238,769	\$198,647	206,006	\$57,901
1836	583,893	493,159	80,251	31,614
1837	3,921,259	4,154,325	46,772	20,823
1838	894,536	896,560	54,282	20,511
1839	32,884	35,270	196,869	96,326

The duty on wheat and potatoes was fixed in 1824 at 25 cents a bushel on wheat and 10 cents a bushel on potatoes, and has remained the same to this time; and it is now, for the first time, proposed to reduce the duty on these articles.

*The largest portion of our agricultural productions are, and must continue to be, consumed in the United States.*—This always has been, and always will be, the case. But few persons are aware of the immense difference which exists between the large amount of those farming products which is consumed in the United States, (which is our home market,) and the small amount of those articles which is exported to foreign countries.

The following statement, taken from "table O" appended to the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury to Congress at its present session, shows *the value of the articles of domestic produce raised by the farming States, which have been exported to foreign countries for five years.*

Years.	Flour.	Pork, hogs, lard, &c.	Beef, cattle, hides, &c..	Butter and cheese.
1838	\$3,603,299	\$1,312,346	\$528,231	\$148,191
1839	6,925,170	1,777,230	371,646	127,550
1840	10,143,615	1,894,894	623,373	210,749
1841	7,759,646	2,621,537	904,918	504,815
1842	7,375,356	2,629,403	1,212,638	388,185
Five years,	35,807,086	10,235,407	3,640,806	1,379,490
Average,	\$7,161,417	2,047,081	728,161	275,898

Taking, therefore, the average exports of these five years, which is greater than it would be for any preceding five years, and we have a total value of annual exports of the products of the farming States amounting to \$10,212,557.

By the census returns of 1840, the amount of the *annual products* of agriculture, commerce, mines, &c., was ascertained. The recent valuable and accurate work of Professor Tucker, of Virginia, gives all the items, and the estimated value of these products. From this work (page 195) we learn that the *annual value* of the products of agriculture in the United States amounts to \$654,387,597. In this estimate are included the products of cotton, rice, and tobacco, which constitute our principal agricultural exports. I have taken the pains to calculate the value of these articles, as reported in the census of 1840, which were produced in that year. They stand as follows :

Tobacco	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$10,103,417
Rice	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,953,840
Cotton	-	-	-	-	-	-	57,130,252
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-	69,187,409
Add sugar raised in Louisiana and Florida	-	-	-	-	-	-	4,814,427
							<hr/>
							\$74,001,836

The returns in these articles, as in all the other agricultural productions, it is believed, fall short of the amount produced ; but as the omissions are uniform on all the articles, it will make no difference in any calculations we propose to make.

The gross annual productions of agriculture are	-	-	-	-	\$654,387,597
Deduct the annual value of cotton, rice, tobacco, and sugar produced	-				74,001,836
					<hr/>
And it leaves a balance of	-	-	-	-	580,385,761
Deduct average exports of agriculture, exclusive of cotton, rice, and tobacco					10,212,557
					<hr/>
Balance	-	-	-	-	\$570,173,204

This value of the products of agriculture, amounting to the vast sum of five hundred and seventy millions of dollars, is annually consumed in the United States, and consists almost entirely of those articles which are produced in greatest abundance in the farming States. The exports of the products of the farming States only average the small sum of ten millions two hundred thousand dollars. Will any reasonable, sensible man, with these facts before him, which admit of neither contradiction, denial, or refutation, pretend that the farmers of the United States do, and must, depend upon the foreign market, rather than the home market in the United States, for the sale of their products.

We will now turn our calculations in another direction. Our whole population in 1840, was 17,063,353.

The producing classes of the country were then divided as follows :

[illegible]

Internal navigation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	33,076
Learned professions	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	65,255
Total	-	-							<u>4,798,870</u>

Without entering into minute fractional calculations, the whole population, including the families of those dependant upon the producing classes, were divided thus :

Agriculture	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13,000,000
Manufactures	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,000,000
All other pursuits	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,000,000
Total	-	-							<u>17,000,000</u>

If we add the whole population of South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Florida, Louisiana, and that portion of the States of Virginia, North Carolina, Maryland, Kentucky, Tennessee, Arkansas, and Missouri, which are engaged and interested in the production of cotton, rice, tobacco, and sugar, it will be found that their total population does not

exceed	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,500,000
Add to this the population subsisting by manufactures and other pursuits	-								<u>4,000,000</u>

And it makes a total of	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<u>7,500,000</u>
Deduct this from the total population of the Union, and it leaves the number of farmers subsisting by growing grain and raising stock	-	-	-						9,500,000

In justice to the farming interest, I must now show the inequality which exists between the farming and planting States in the sales of their products in foreign markets, and the plain statement of the facts will be a stronger argument in favor of encouraging and building up a home market for the farming interest, than any other which can be urged. Here is a statement of the exports of cotton, rice, and tobacco, for five years, taken from the table (O) appended to the last report of the Secretary of the Treasury.

					Cotton.	Tobacco.	Rice.
1838	-	-	-	-	\$61,556,811	\$7,392,029	\$1,721,819
1839	-	-	-	-	61,238,982	9,832,943	2,460,198
1840	-	-	-	-	63,870,307	8,883,957	1,942,076
1841	-	-	-	-	54,330,341	12,576,703	2,010,107
1842	-	-	-	-	47,593,464	9,540,755	1,907,387
Average	-	-			<u>\$57,717,981</u>	<u>\$9,645,277</u>	<u>\$2,008,317</u>

The exports of cotton, rice, and tobacco, which find a foreign market, average the annual sum of

	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$69,371,575
The population sustained by the production of cotton, rice, and tobacco, was estimated at	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,500,000
Deduct the slaves which constitute a portion of the population which are engaged in these productions	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<u>1,500,000</u>

Leaves of white population	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<u>2,000,000</u>
----------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------

If we divide the amount of sales of the exports arising from cotton, tobacco, and rice, equally amongst the two millions of white inhabitants, it will be seen that they have a foreign market which brings \$34 68 cts. to each white inhabitant, sustained by those products.

I have before shown that the average annual export of all products raised in the farming States amounts to

In producing this, we have seen there are engaged 9,500,000 persons. Deduct the slaves in those States employed in farming, which may fairly be estimated at 1,000,000, and it leaves 8,500,000 white inhabitants, amongst whom the value of the export of farming products is to be distributed. Divide this equally amongst them, and it will be seen, that the share of each white inhabitant, sustained by farming products, arising from the sale of these products in foreign markets, is one dollar and twenty cents—(\$1 20). Our southern planters have a foreign market which brings them \$34 68 cents a head, whilst the farmers of the middle and northern States

have a foreign market which brings them only \$1 20 cents a head. When it is recollected that the value of the annual products of the farming interest is — — — \$580,385,761, and the export is only — — — — — 10,212,557, the utter insignificance of the foreign market, and its inability (under existing commercial regulations) to consume the surplus farming products is glaringly apparent. Will any person, after examining this estimate, pretend that the home market for farming products is insignificant? And will any one persist in contending that the small amount of those productions which are sold for exportation can, or does, regulate the value of all the products of farming industry? Certainly not; unless they design willfully to close their eyes to reason and fact, and blindly follow the fanciful wanderings of abstract theory, instead of the sober and instructive lessons of fact and experience.

*I will now proceed to examine the causes why we do not export a greater amount of farming products.*

An examination of the exports of farming products to foreign countries from the United States shows that the aggregate value of these exports has increased very slowly for the last fifty years. Our population has steadily increased at the rate of three per cent. per annum during that period; and yet the value of our exports of provisions remains very nearly stationary. As production has increased at an equal pace with population, it is evident that the distributive share of each citizen of the value of exports of farming products is annually diminishing. To those who carefully and judiciously examine the aspect of foreign nations there is no appearance whatever of a largely increased demand for such productions. The whole civilized world is at peace without any prospect of war. Each nation is striving to develop all its resources, and is seeking to give its own population lucrative employment, and to render itself independent of all other nations for the supply of those articles which are necessary to sustain its inhabitants. To the continent of Europe we export no farming products. On the contrary, a very large portion of it raises a vast superabundance of grain, which can be greatly increased if there should arise an adequate market for it. Should the ports of Great Britain be opened to the free importation of breadstuffs, the cheapness of labor and proximity to market of the European grain growing States would be found to counterbalance the greater fertility of our soil. If they did not drive us from the market from the smaller freights which they would have to pay, and other causes stated above, they would be found to be energetic competitors with us in the markets of England.

In McCulloch's Commercial Dictionary, page 515, speaking of wheat, it is said—

"It ought also to be remarked, that the prices in America *are usually higher* than in the Baltic; so that but little can be brought from the former, except when the demand is sufficient previously to take off the *cheaper wheats* of the northern ports."

But is there any just prospect of Great Britain reducing her duties so low as to admit our provisions freely into her markets? No one who will take the pains to inform himself, and will be candid, will so contend. The whig ministry in England, a few years since, proposed a reduction of their tariff on provisions; and on the question being made before the country as the test of parties at their elections, they were driven from office by a very large majority, and a tory ministry placed in their stead. Very recently, during the present session of Parliament, the two highest officers in the ministry, Sir Robert Peel and the Duke of Wellington, in answer to interrogatories, whether they proposed to reduce the duties on provisions, replied in their places, in Parliament, that they had no intention of bringing forward any such proposition.

The British government, in practice, is more an aristocracy than a monarchy. Nine-tenths of the landed estate of Great Britain belongs to the nobility and gentry. All of the members of the House of Lords, and a large majority of the House of Commons, are large landed proprietors. Their income depends, in a great measure, upon the rents of their lands. If the price

of provisions is high, high rents can be promptly paid. If agricultural industry is depressed, their income falls off.

The average annual revenue of Great Britain for ten years preceding 1842 was	-	£47,000,000
Payments for interest on public debt and annuities	- - - -	31,000,000
Applicable to ordinary expenditures	- - - -	16,000,000

Being two-thirds of the revenue applied to pay the public debt and annuities, and one-third of the revenue only applicable to the ordinary expenditures. These government taxes, and rents, and tithes, are enormous and oppressive, generally consuming from two-thirds to three-fourths of the value of the crops raised by the farmers. The prices of provisions are kept up by a tariff which is prohibitory on most articles, and which is exorbitant on all. Suppose this tariff was taken off, and provisions were supplied from the continent of Europe and the United States cheaper than the farmers of England could afford to sell them, what would be the consequence? The farmers would be unable to pay their rents, the government could not collect its taxes, the clergy could not collect their tithes, and the nobility and gentry would be deprived of the greater portion of their income. Can any one be so visionary as to suppose that the aristocracy, who absolutely control the House of Peers, and have the ascendancy in the House of Commons, will ever permit such a state of things to be brought about? Certainly not. For the result of such a state of things would be a subversion not only of the policy, but also, in all probability, of the very foundation of the government itself.

It is often alleged that the anti-corn law league will produce an entire revolution of the English corn laws. This is by no means probable. Its members are composed almost entirely of the manufacturing classes, which, though numerous and wealthy, have very little political influence, as the control of the government is not in the hands of the masses of the population in England, but in those of the aristocracy.

*Free trade is a theory whose beauties have been sung for the last fifty years in England; yet the Government has never made one step towards adopting its practice.* On the contrary, although the government has been alternately in the hands of all political parties in England, yet their policy in protecting every species of British industry has been uniformly the same. Their writers and orators are eloquent in praise of a theory which they never have, and never mean to practice, but which they are exceedingly anxious to persuade other nations to adopt. The reason is obvious. If the ports of other nations are opened to their shipping and manufactures without duties to countervail those imposed by England, the superiority of Great Britain in her machinery and capital, and the cheapness and abundance of pauper labor employed in manufactures, together with the vast amount of her shipping, would enable her to undersell almost any other nation in their own markets. Thus England would be realizing the benefits of "free trade" by flooding other nations with her surplus products, whilst she would be sacrificing nothing in return, and would refuse to receive the products of those nations, unless they were indispensably necessary to support her own industry. In no nation of the earth has the doctrine of "free trade" ever been adopted in practice; and it never can be whilst any one commercial nation, from policy or necessity, imposes high duties on the products of another. The nation which would adopt it, would find itself flooded with the surplus products of other countries to the destruction of its own industry; and as it could find no corresponding sale for its surplus products, the balance of trade would continue against it, and in a few years impoverish it, or make it a dependency of the nation to which it would become indebted, and by which it was supplied with foreign productions.

ENGLISH DUTIES.—A very considerable modification of the duties on many articles of provision, was made in England a few years since. It was thought that a large amount of farm-

ing products would be exported thence, owing to this modification. The tables given above show this has not been the case. Below is a statement showing the duty levied on the principal agricultural products of the United States, by the last English tariff, and the amount of revenue collected by the British Government on each article in 1840, which is taken from page 7, Doc. 29, 3 sess., 27 Congress, being the report on the commercial systems of other nations, made by the Secretary of State.

ARTICLES.							Duty.	Net amt. of duties received in 1840 by Great Britain.
Beef salted, per bbl.	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$3 84	\$11,918
Bacon, per 112 lbs.	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 36	312
Butter do	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 80	1,236,849
Cotton do	-	-	-	-	-	-	70	3,176,401
Corn, Indian, average per bushel	-	-	-	-	-	-	18	-
Flour, average per bbl.	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 60	-
Wheat, average per bushel	-	-	-	-	-	-	33	-
Tallow, per 112 lbs.	-	-	-	-	-	-	76	893,769
Rice do	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 44	2,500
Hams do	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 36	11,467
Pork, salted do	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 92	2,174
Lead do	-	-	-	-	-	-	48	144
Oats, average per bushel	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	-
Soap, per lb.	-	-	-	-	-	-	6 $\frac{1}{4}$	6,206
Tobacco, unmanufactured, per lb.	-	-	-	-	-	-	72	16,790,937
Tobacco, manufactured do	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 16	432,220
Spirits from grain, per gal.	-	-	-	-	-	-	5 40	-
Spirits from molasses do	-	-	-	-	-	-	5 40	6,136,272

Estimating the prices of provisions in St. Louis, Alton, Cincinnati, or Louisville, which constitute the principal provision marts of the United States, at the price of those articles where they are most usually put up, it will be found that the British duty on beef is fifty per cent.; on bacon, pork, and butter, one hundred per cent.; on flour, corn, and wheat, thirty-three per cent.; on tobacco, one thousand per cent.; and on spirits, sixteen hundred per cent.

When it is remembered that all the articles produced by farmers are bulky, that the distance of transportation is so great, and that the freight is consequently very high; and when to all these disadvantages is added the enormous duty levied on these articles by England, it is not surprising that we do not export larger amounts of farming products to that country. Nor can it be conceived that any large increase can be made of the amount of exports of these articles from any probable cause whatever.

**DUTIES IN CUBA.**—Our commerce with the island of Cuba is very considerable. They do not raise flour or corn there at all, and but a small quantity of meat, and are almost wholly dependent for these articles upon other nations. The United States supplies her with the largest amounts of these articles, and purchases in return her coffee, sugars, segars, and fruits. The duties levied on the farming products of the United States in that island are enormous; and to show their operation, I will read an extract from Doc. 163, 2d sess. 27th Congress, being the Report of the Secretary of State, showing the “commercial relations of the United States with foreign nations,” page 32:

“The effect of these restrictions creating a balance against the United States, can be seen from the following actual case: In the month of November, 1841, a vessel of the United States, registered 140 tons, entered the port of Havana with the following manifest of cargo, shipped at New Orleans—

650 barrels of flour.

28,392 pounds of lard.

8,400 pounds of hams.

1 sofa.

*Estimated cost at New Orleans.*

650 barrels of flour, at \$6 per barrel	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$3,900
28,392 pounds of lard, at 6 cts. per pound	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,697
8,400 pounds of hams, at 6 cts. per pound	-	-	-	-	-	-	504
1 sofa	-	-	-	-	-	-	20
							<u>\$6,121</u>

*Value of cargo in Havana.*

650 barrels of flour, at \$15 per barrel	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$9,750
28,292 pounds of lard, at \$12 per 100 pounds	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,396
8,400 pounds of hams, at \$14 per 100 pounds	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,176
1 sofa	-	-	-	-	-	-	35
							<u>\$14,357</u>

*Import duties paid.*

650 barrels of flour, at the rate of \$10 10 cents per barrel	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$6,565
28,292 pounds of lard, at the rate of \$4 19 per 100 pounds	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,185
8,400 pounds of hams, at the rate of \$3 14 per 100 pounds	-	-	-	-	-	-	263
1 sofa	-	-	-	-	-	-	14
Tonnage duties, \$1 50 per ton	-	-	-	-	-	-	210
Dredging machine duty, 21 cts. per ton	-	-	-	-	-	-	30
Wharf duties for 10 days, \$1 65 per diem	-	-	-	-	-	-	16
							<u>\$8,286</u>
From value of cargo at Havana	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$14,357
Subtract duties and port charges	-	-	-	-	-	-	8,286
Net	-	-	-	-	-	-	<u>\$6,070</u>
From original cost	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$6,121
Subtract net in Havana	-	-	-	-	-	-	6,070
Balance against cargo	-	-	-	-	-	-	<u>\$51"</u>

It may be inquired if a loss thus occurs on the shipment of produce, how is the trade maintained? It is thus: The proceeds of the cargo are invested in coffee and fruits which pay no duty in the United States, and in sugar which pays two and a half cents per pound, and segars which pay a light duty; and thus by our kindness in permitting these products of Cuba to enter our ports with light or no duties, the merchant is enabled to keep up the trade by the profit on the return cargo.

Those who wish to examine the duties levied in all countries upon the agricultural products of the United States will find them accurately and fully stated in House Doc. 177 of the 1st session of the 28th Congress, being the recent "Annual Report of the Commissioner of Patents," pages 185 to 203. Enough, however, has been shown from authentic official documents to convince every farmer how our farming products are burdened by duties in other countries, and why our exports of these articles are so small.

We will turn our attention now to another branch of the subject which may be elucidated by the statement of the cargo shipped to Havana, and which goes to prove that *the theory of the free trade politicians, who contend that the consumer always pays and loses the duty at last, is erroneus*. It further proves that the duty is often paid and lost in part, and sometimes wholly, by the producer. Suppose a produce dealer at one of our western marts designs to purchase a cargo of flour for shipment to the West Indies. He first ascertains the price at Havana for flour to be \$15 per barrel. He then calculates the cost of freight to New Orleans, inspection, drayage, cooperage, reshipment and freight to Havana, which will come to, say, \$1 per barrel. To this he adds the duty of \$10 10 per barrel. To indemnify him for his time, interest, and risk,

he estimates that he ought to realize a profit of \$1 per barrel. His expenses and profits on a barrel of flour will be \$12 10. His sales there will realize \$15 per barrel; and his expenses being \$12 10 per barrel, it will be seen that he can only afford to give \$2 90 cents to the farmer or miller for a barrel of flour, although he should sell the flour for \$15 per barrel. And unless the farmer will sell at this low rate, he will not buy at all, as he would lose money by giving more. If the tariff was taken off in Cuba, and the price continued any where in the neighborhood of what we have estimated, the merchant could and would give a better price for the flour. But as long as the duty and freight have to be paid, and are not reduced, it is plain that the farmer must accommodate his price to suit the market, and that the market is not regulated to suit him. Although the consumer in Cuba pays a high price for flour, yet it is seen that the farmer who produced the flour, or the merchant who acts as his factor, pays the duty, and loses in the value of his produce by this tariff.

The same principle may be applied to articles of hardware, clothing, &c., imported from abroad. The importing merchant can get but so much for them here. If he asks more, our manufacturers, or those of other nations, would undersell him. He estimates the freight, commission, tariff, &c., and then gives such a price to the producer as he can afford; and the producer of the hardware or woollens must take what he offers, or go without our market. The producer has to take what he can get; and if the price is too low, he cuts down the wages of his hands and his profits to accommodate his business to the tariff regulations of the countries into which his products are exported.

Having thus explained the causes why so small an amount of farming products is exported, and the effects of the tariff of foreign countries in reducing the prices of those articles in the United States; and having, as I think, fully demonstrated that it is in vain for the farmers of the United States to expect to obtain a foreign market for their products at all adequate to consume their immensely increasing production, I will now ask attention to the inquiry—

*Have we a home market of any value? And can we increase that market so as to consume the surplus products of the farming States?*

Between every portion of the United States there exists perfect free trade, retarded only by the cost of transportation from one section of the Union to the other. The farmers have the whole Union for their home market. The quantity of provisions imported from other countries has usually been small; and if it should at all interfere with agricultural industry, Congress has the power to impose restrictions upon the importation of foreign agricultural products, so as to exclude them from our ports, as was done in 1789 by the first Congress which convened after the adoption of our Constitution.

Owing to the extent of our country, and its capability of profitably producing every variety of production, the value of our home market is greater than is usually imagined.

9,500,000 persons, being something more than half of our whole population, are sustained by farming.

3,500,000 persons, being one-fifth of the whole, are sustained by planting cotton, rice, tobacco, and sugar.

3,000,000 persons, being about one-sixth of the whole, are sustained by manufactures.

1,000,000 persons are sustained by commercial and professional pursuits.

The market afforded for farming products in the planting States is considerable, and would be much greater, if the planters confined their production to cotton, rice, tobacco, and sugar, exclusively. But this is far from being the case. The tobacco planters raise all their own supplies, and the cotton and rice planters, of late years, have extensively cultivated farming products; and of course the market from this source has been diminished.

The manufacturers, commercial, and professional men, are wholly dependent for supplies upon

the home market. The demand from this source for farming products has been and still is increasing. It is evident that the more persons who are profitably engaged in these pursuits, the more persons there will be to feed, and consequently the better will be our home market. *The disadvantage under which the farmer labors is that there is too large a portion of our population engaged in raising farming products, and too few persons profitably employed in other pursuits to purchase and consume the farmer's surplus produce.* The remedy is apparent. If a large portion of our population, now engaged in farming, find it to their advantage to engage in commercial or manufacturing pursuits, they become consumers instead of producers of farming products. *The very object and effect of the protective policy is to produce this result.* By affording adequate protection to manufactures, miners, &c., persons before employed in farming become manufacturers, mechanics, or miners. And thus, instead of competing with farmers in producing and selling farming products, they bring a market to the doors of our farmers for the sale of those products which before remained as drugs upon their hands.

Again: The number of persons employed in manufactures in the United States does not at all affect the foreign demand for farming products. The foreign market for our provisions is altogether controlled by the legislation or necessities of each particular country, and is not in any respect affected by the legislation or business pursuits of our own country. Whether we have manufactures or not, we will have this foreign market, and we cannot increase it by destroying our manufactures. The extension of manufactures does increase the demand for farming products. How wise and statesmanlike, then, is that policy which builds us up a home market for these products, often at the very doors of the farmers, in addition to our foreign market. The demand for provisions, which is increased by the enlarged number of manufacturers, mechanics, and miners, and the competition produced by the demand for the foreign and home market, *do necessarily increase the price of his produce to the farmer.* And thus the great desideratum of the farmer, which is to obtain a fair price for his labor and capital invested in farming, is obtained.

It is not, however, extravagant prices that the farmer desires. Steadiness and stability, with small regular profits, are far better to him than fluctuating prices, with occasional extravagant returns. Continued fluctuations in price are alike injurious to the farmer and the manufacturer. If we depend upon foreign countries for a market for our produce, or for our supplies of manufactures, we are always liable to be injured by the legislation or vicissitudes of those countries. Our true policy, then, is to find a home market for our farming products, and a home-made supply of manufactured articles.

Another advantage of this system is obvious to every reflecting mind—*It retains our wealth at home to build up and improve our own country, instead of sending it abroad to foster the manufactures and increase the wealth of foreign nations.* What has given England her enormous wealth? It is that her manufactories are the workshops, and her shipping are the carriers, of the world. The money we pay out to her for manufactures goes to support her laborers and enrich her pampered aristocracy. Why should we longer do this? We know we can manufacture every article she does; and by expending our money for manufactures produced among us, we help to sustain our own laborers, and add to the aggregate wealth of the whole community. Besides this, if the manufacturer is making fair living profits, he is the better able to give good prices, and wants and uses more horses and other products raised by farmers.

If the entire population of Cincinnati, Louisville, or St. Louis, by law or circumstances were compelled to purchase all their provisions from a single Congressional district, it would certainly add to the value of the products of that district. This would be owing to the fact that there would be a greater demand for these products to feed the persons engaged in manufactures and commerce in those cities. The same effect which such a provision would have upon a single Congressional district, the protective policy has upon the entire farming interest in the

United States. By increasing the number of consumers, it adds to the demand and value of the farmers' produce.

I think, then, I have clearly demonstrated these propositions:

1. That a protective tariff decreases the number of persons engaged in farming, and increases the number of persons engaged in manufactures and mining.
2. That the market for farming products is enlarged by many persons becoming consumers instead of being producers of those products.
3. That the ability of the consumer to purchase is increased.
4. That competition is produced by the demand between the foreign and home markets.
5. That the necessary result of the above propositions (which is corroborated by experience) is, that the value of farming products is increased.
6. That stability and uniformity of prices is produced.
7. That the aggregate wealth of our country is increased.

Whilst advocating a protective tariff I wish it, however, to be understood that neither myself, or the party with which I act, advocates an extravagant, a prohibitory, or high protective tariff. All the protection which is demanded by American industry, can be afforded by a proper discrimination in the imposition of duties to raise the amount of revenue which is required to support the Government. It is not asked that revenue be raised, or high duties be imposed, for the purpose of protection. But we do contend that sound American policy demands, that the revenue which is required to defray the ordinary expenditures of Government, should be collected by the imposition of duties so adjusted as to protect every branch of American industry. In raising a revenue, I understand the true rule is—*To impose the duties on all articles which can be successfully supplied by American industry, so as to produce competition between the American farmer, miner, and manufacturer, and the importer of similar foreign products.*

Such is the tariff policy we advocate, and its obvious justice and propriety commends it to the good sense and patriotic feeling of every American citizen.

*The amount of farming products consumed by manufacturers.*—It is often said that the amount of farming products consumed by the manufacturers is very trifling. There is an egregious mistake in this assumption, and I propose to give some extracts from Professor Tucker's work on the census of 1840, which will enable every one to form correct conclusions on this subject. On page 195 is a table, exhibiting the "*value of the annual products of industry in the several States.*" The aggregate result is as follows:

"Agriculture	-	-	-	-	-	\$654,387,597
"Manufactures	-	-	-	-	-	239,836,224
"Commerce	-	-	-	-	-	78,721,086
"Mining	-	-	-	-	-	42,358,761
"Forest	-	-	-	-	-	16,835,060
"Fisheries	-	-	-	-	-	11,996,008
Total						\$1,063,134,736 "

From pages 197 and 198 I take these extracts:

"Of the wheat, Indian corn, and other grain used for bread, and potatoes, the quantities produced by the different great divisions of the States, and the proportion to each inhabitant, are as follows:

Geographical divisions.	Population.	Bushels of grain, exclusive of oats.	Proport'n to each person	Bush. of potatoes.	Proport'n to each person
New England States	2,231,822	12,506,000	5½	35,181,000	15¾
Middle States	5,118,076	89,952,000	17½	42,969,000	8½
Southern States	3,279,006	111,680,000	33½	9,710,000	3
Southwestern States	2,245,602	95,982,000	42¾	6,862,000	3
Northwestern States	4,057,313	179,620,000	43½	12,615,000	3

"It thus appears the proportion of grain to each inhabitant in the western States is eight times as great as it is in New England, and two and a half times as great as it is in the middle States. If we add the proportion of potatoes to that of the grain, and suppose four bushels of the former to be equal to one of the latter, then the difference between the western States and New England will be as five to one, and between the former and the middle States as two and a quarter to one.

*"It should further be remarked, that about fifteen-sixteenths of the grain and potatoes produced in the United States are consumed at home, either directly, or in the form of animal food, and only one-sixteenth is sent abroad.*

"The quantity of food annually consumed in the United States by a family of five persons, after deducting one-sixteenth of the grain for the amount exported, and one-tenth for seed, is as follows: Indian corn, 85 bushels; wheat, rye, &c., 25 bushels; oats, 28 bushels; potatoes, 25 bushels.

"The average of domestic animals to each family is as follows: horses and mules, one and one-sixteenth; cattle, four; sheep, five and a quarter; hogs, seven.

"To the articles annually consumed by a family, are to be added poultry to the value of \$2 25; pickled fish, one-third of a barrel; rice, twelve pounds; sugar, forty-two pounds; besides garden vegetables, products of the orchard, and game."

The number of bushels of corn, wheat, and rye used in each family of five persons in the United States is 110. The population of New England is 2,234,822, and the number of families, allowing five to each family, is 446,964. If each of these consume 110 bushels of grain, it will make the aggregate consumption of bushels of grain . . . . . 49,166,040.  
Deduct amount raised in New England . . . . . 12,506,000

Leaving a balance to be purchased of other States . . . . . 36,660,000

It may be that not so large an amount of grain is used in New England as in other States, in which case this amount will be greater than is actually purchased. But this estimate being founded on actual data, is sufficiently accurate to satisfy any one that an immense amount of farming products is purchased by New England of other States.

In table B, appended to the report of the Committee on Manufactures, made to this House at its present session, is a detailed statement, exhibiting an "estimate of the products of the soil, &c., of other States in the Union, consumed or manufactured annually in Massachusetts," which shows an aggregate amount of \$40,741,150.

When we remember that the amount of products consumed by the manufacturers of all the other States is to be added to this estimate, we can form some idea of the vast amount of products which is annually consumed by those dependent upon manufactures throughout the Union. Considering how large a proportion of the provisions and stock used by the planters is produced by themselves, and that none of those articles are produced by the manufacturers, it is fair to estimate, that there is twice as large an amount of farming products consumed by the manufacturers, (which of course includes the mechanics,) in the United States, as there is purchased by the planters of the farmers. To some this may, at first, appear an erroneous estimate; but an examination of the facts will convince the most incredulous of its accuracy.

The present extensive and flourishing system of manufactures in the United States is the result of the wise fostering and protecting policy of our Government, which was adopted efficiently by the tariff of 1824. Such a system does not grow of itself, but in all countries, as in our own, it has at first been found to require the protecting hand of the Government. Its effect in the United States will appear from the following extracts from Professor Tucker's work, pages 207-'8:

"The gross annual amount of the manufactures, (in 1820,) so far as it can be gathered from such defective returns, appears to be only \$36,115,000, and the capital employed in them to be \$41,507,000. \* \* Perhaps the best mode of comparing the manufactures of 1820 with those of 1840, is to compare the number of persons employed in those years. \* \* The number employed in 1820 was 56,296. The whole number of persons employed in 1840 was 455,663; that is as 100 to 809; which supposes an extraordinary decennial increase of 284 per cent. After making the most liberal deductions from this estimate for the omissions in

the returns of 1820, the remainder shows an advancement in this branch of industry that is without an example. As a further evidence of the same fact, we find that while no other branch of our domestic exports has been doubled since 1820, that of manufactures has increased six-fold; that is, from \$2,342,000 to \$12,868,840 in 1840, and \$13,523,072 in 1841."

From the tables above given, it will be seen that manufactures sustain nearly one-sixth of the entire population of the United States, yield more than a fourth of the value of the entire annual product of American industry, and produce an annual value three times as great as the whole value of the cotton, rice, tobacco, and sugar crops of the Union. If this immense interest is suffered to languish, or is destroyed, as seems to be the wish of some politicians, the persons engaged in that branch of industry must go to tilling the earth, and the persons employed in raising sheep, (who now purchase a large portion of their provisions,) must kill their flocks, and turn their pastures into grain fields. The inevitable result will be over-production, and a deficient market; prices of farming products will be merely nominal, and universal distress will pervade the community. It is not, therefore, and never can be, the interest of the farmers, that those persons now engaged in manufactures should become farmers, and thus help to supply an already glutted market.

A nation which is exclusively agricultural may be virtuous and hospitable, but it can never become wealthy, powerful, or independent. To combine these advantages it must encourage wise and liberal systems of commerce and manufactures—not as a means to advance the peculiar interests of any one section, but the extended, general interests of the whole. I wish, therefore, to see manufactures extended into every part of this nation. North Carolina, Virginia, Tennessee, Kentucky, and all the States north of them, have within them all the elements of vast manufacturing wealth. If our present wise protective policy is adhered to, its effects will soon be seen in the extensive manufactories which are being erected in all these States; and in my own lovely and fertile State, I look forward to the day as not far distant when our prairies will be studded with manufactories, thus relieving us of a long and expensive transportation for a large amount of our produce, and affording us a market for it within our own borders.

*The protective policy is either directly or indirectly an advantage to every class of the community.* I will proceed briefly to illustrate this by showing the number of producers who are interested in the protection of the article of sugar. In a memorial from the Legislature of Louisiana to Congress, made in 1840, to be found in House Doc. 461, of 2d session, 27th Congress, it appears that there were then in Louisiana 525 sugar plantations, in which it is stated there were invested \$52,000,000, being about \$100,000 to each plantation. The duty on sugar is now 2½ cents per pound. The imports in 1842 amounted to 6,370,775 pounds; the duty levied on this importation was consequently \$159,268. According to the theory of free trade, this would be a tax on the consumers of sugar, which took that sum out of their pockets and placed about \$300 a year in the pockets of each of the sugar planters. The theory would make their profits to be exorbitant, but the memorial states the net profits to be less than six per cent. per annum.

The number of persons directly protected is only 525. Let us see how many are indirectly protected. It is a plain principle that all persons who are advantaged by the protection of sugar are interested in its protection, as our sugar plantations would instantly be broken down without protection. It requires a vast outlay to create a sugar plantation; there must be a number of hands, horses and mules, sugar houses, sugar mills, a steam engine, &c. &c. To build the sugar houses and mills gives employment to carpenters, most of whom go from the western States to the south for this purpose. Carpenters are, then, interested in this protection. To boil the sugar cane they must have large cast-iron kettles; these are chiefly furnished from the Tennessee iron works. Consequently the owner of the furnace, the miner who digs the iron ore, the wagoner who hauls it, the laborer who cuts and hauls the wood, or digs the coal used in smelting, the farmers who furnish the provisions used by these hands and the food for their

teams, all residing in Tennessee, are interested in the protection afforded to sugar, by the market it affords to their products. To grind the sugar cane they use steam engines; these are furnished from the cities on the Ohio river, generally from Cincinnati. Here the owner of the foundry, the various workmen on the boilers, piston-rods, valves &c., employed in the construction of engines, as well as the Ohio farmer who supplies them with flour, meat, and vegetables, are all interested in the protection of sugar. To make the engine there must be iron; this comes generally from the mines in Pennsylvania. In that State the miners, laborers, wagoners, and farmers are employed and interested as in Tennessee. To tend their crops and haul the cane and sugar, they must have horses and mules; these are not raised in the south, but come principally from Kentucky, Missouri, and Illinois. This gives employment and market for the farmers of these States. To feed their hands they must have pork, beef, corn, flour, and vegetables. But few of these articles are raised on the sugar plantations, and they are supplied by the farmers of Kentucky, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Missouri. To clothe the laborers there are used cloths manufactured in New England and Kentucky, which gives employment to the wool-growers and manufacturers of those States. And to transport the engines and provisions required for these plantations down the Mississippi, and the sugar up that stream, gives employment to steamboats, and consequently interests those numerous persons employed on board or sustained by the running of these vessels. Thus it will be seen that the carpenters of the west, the miners of coal and iron in Tennessee and Pennsylvania, the mechanics of Cincinnati, the farmers of Tennessee, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois, and Missouri, the manufacturers and wool-growers in New England and Kentucky, the steamboat owners and men engaged in boating on the Mississippi, are all indirectly concerned in the successful prosecution of the sugar plantations in Louisiana, and all receive a share of the advantages which result from the protection extended to sugar. And there is not a barrel of sugar produced in Louisiana, in which there are less than a thousand persons interested, directly or indirectly, in its production, and consequently in its protection.

The advantages which result to different classes of the community by the protection afforded to manufactures of iron, wool, and cotton, which are and can be produced without limitation in our own country, may be illustrated in the same manner; but the example I have given is sufficient to convince the most sceptical of the intimate relations which exist between all classes of citizens, and the incidental protection extended by a protective tariff to all branches of American industry.

*The ultimate effect of a protective tariff is to reduce the price of manufactured articles.* According to the theory and allegations of the advocates of free trade, this is an absurdity. I am no theorizer. It has been the object of my whole life, in theory and practice, to arrive at practical results, and I must therefore acknowledge that I have a contempt for all theories, however plausible, which contradict the acknowledged experience of all countries and ages, and of every man in the community. The true way to reason is that of the inductive philosophy, which first ascertains facts and then draws its conclusions. Free trade men first form their theories, and then make all facts bow, bend, or break, to accommodate them to their theories.

It is a fact that in 1820 we had very few manufactories in the United States. Immediately after the passage of the protective tariff of 1824, manufactures sprung up throughout our country. When the protective policy has been steady they have increased and flourished; when it has fluctuated they have decreased and languished. The prices of cotton, iron, woollen, and other manufactures which have been carried on extensively, have greatly decreased. I will not stop to give a table of prices, for the fact is known to all. The way in which the tariff operates to reduce prices is this: The American manufacturer, after the imposition of a duty, can calculate whether he can produce a given article profitably, and as the tariff serves to prevent

him from being driven out of his own market by the foreign importer, he goes steadily to work. If his business becomes profitable, others engage in it; a competition in the sale of the manufactured articles is produced between our own manufacturers, and between the American and foreign manufacturer. Competition and continual occupation at any one branch of industry causes economy in management, and improvement in machinery. The inevitable consequence of improvement in machinery and competition in sales is to reduce the price of the manufactured article. Such is the fact, and such is the reason of that fact.

It is said, "Here is a contradiction. You contended that a protective tariff increased the price of farming products, and now you contend that it decreases the price of manufactured products." There is no contradiction. Both positions are true. The effect of such a policy is to increase the number of producers and sellers of manufactured articles in the one case, and to increase the number of purchasers and consumers of farming products in the other. In the one case there is competition *in the sale of goods*; in the other, *in the purchase of farming products*. When there is competition in selling, the price falls; when there is competition in purchasing, the price rises. For instance, if five men want to purchase the same horse, their competition increases his price; but if five farmers want to sell five horses to one man who only desires one, their competition reduces the price of all the horses. This is the principle of the operation of a protective tariff on manufactures and farming products; and the man who can't or won't understand this, is either too wilfully blind to see, or too hopelessly dull to reason.

*It is not the interest of the farmers of the United States to buy those manufactures which can be produced in the United States, of foreign nations, even although the nominal money price is less.* Gold and silver are not produced in the United States, and consequently we have it not to exchange for manufactures. Farmers, like all other classes, must pay for what they purchase with their produce. Foreign nations will not take farming products for their manufactures. What good does it do an Illinois farmer, who wants clothes and blankets, to tell him how cheap they are in England, when the cost of transporting his produce and the English corn laws prevent him from taking his produce there to exchange for the articles he wants? You may buy a yard of cloth in England for two bushels of wheat, when it would take three bushels of wheat to purchase a similar article of American manufacture. But do you suppose the Illinois farmer is ignorant that it takes two more bushels of wheat to pay for the transportation and duties on the two bushels he sends to England, thus making him pay in reality four bushels of grain for his English cloth, when he could get a similar American article for three bushels. It is the interest of the farmer to seek a market, not where the nominal money price is least, but where he can buy the articles he needs for the fewest bushels of grain or pounds of meat.

"*Buy where you can buy cheapest,*" says the free-trader. "*Buy where you can pay easiest,*" says common sense. The physician or lawyer can generally better afford to pay \$100 in professional services for the rent of a house, than he can \$75 in money; and the farmer in Illinois who desires to purchase the winter clothing of his family, can often better afford to deliver 500 bushels of corn for his goods than to pay \$60 in money for them. The corn he has to spare, and the money he has not got, and cannot get for his produce. If another merchant offered to let him have the same amount of goods for \$50 in money, he could not purchase, because he had not the money; and if he should be induced to purchase on credit, *the balance of trade being against him at the end of the year*, as he could not repudiate, his property to the value of \$100 must be sacrificed to pay for his *cheap purchase*.

The true interest of the farmer is to have the manufactures of those articles he needs as near to him as possible, so that they may be dependant upon him for provisions, as he is upon them for manufactures. An interchange of products is for the mutual benefit of each. Most manufactures being light, when compared with their value, will bear distant transportation; whilst farming products being generally bulky, consume a large portion of their value in the cost of transportation. It is, then, manifestly to the advantage of the farmer to encourage the erection

of manufactories near him, and thus he will save the cost of the transportation of his produce, as well as bring a market to his own door.

The views which I have presented, it will be seen, are confined exclusively to the advantages resulting from a protective tariff, as a means of present pecuniary advantage to the farming interest. I have not adverted, as may with propriety be done, to the vast increase of price which would take place in all manufactured articles imported from abroad, which would take place in time of war, if we were dependant upon foreign countries for these articles. Nor have I appealed to the just national pride and patriotism which is inherent in the bosom of every true-hearted American farmer, and which desires to see our nation wholly independent of foreign nations for all the necessaries of life. I have confined my remarks to a plain, unvarnished statement of facts and arguments, and I leave it now for the American farmer to decide whether the doctrine of free trade, or a protective tariff, is best calculated to advance his interest, and that of the whole country.

## APPENDIX.

*Tabular estimate of the wheat crop for 1842, the number of inhabitants in each State, and the quantity of wheat raised in each State to each inhabitant.\**

States.	Population estimated on the annual increase for 10 years.	Number of bushels of wheat.	Quantity of wheat per inhabitant.				
			B.	p.	gal.	qt.	pt.
Maine -	532,102	1,091,090	2	0	0	2	1
New Hampshire -	287,646	533,006	1	3	0	3	
Massachusetts -	774,536	209,547		1	0	0	1
Rhode Island -	112,319	3,688					1
Connecticut -	313,671	104,673		1	0	2	1
Vermont -	294,884	564,116	1	3	1	1	
New York -	2,592,044	11,132,472	4	1	0	1	
New Jersey -	389,050	874,643	2	1			
Pennsylvania -	1,836,773	10,887,015	5	3	1	2	1
Delaware -	78,384	333,665	4	1			
Maryland -	476,900	2,814,533	5	3	1	0	1
Virginia -	1,248,314	7,502,383	6				
North Carolina -	758,048	1,747,334	2	1	0	1	1
South Carolina -	594,398 in '40	1,059,885	1	3	0	0	1
Georgia -	691,392 in '40	2,203,737	3	1	1	3	
Alabama -	675,116	933,248	1	1	1	1	
Mississippi -	477,360	346,275		3			
Louisiana -	393,745						
Tennessee -	873,400	5,915,032	6	3	0	0	1
Kentucky -	807,401	5,131,114	6	1	0	3	
Ohio -	1,711,935	25,387,439	14	3	0	2	1
Indiana -	788,415	8,500,666	10	3	0	1	
Illinois -	638,784	5,799,038	9				
Missouri -	456,974	1,424,545	3	0	0	1	
Arkansas -							
Michigan -	266,303	3,952,389	14	3	0	3	
Wisconsin -	43,322	434,409	10	0	0	3	
Iowa -	60,456	341,801	5	2	1	1	
District of Columbia -	48,611	10,629			1	2	1

\*Based on the estimates furnished in the report of the Commissioner of Patents for 1843.